## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

## **District of New Mexico**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA V

**Judgment in a Criminal Case** (For Revocation of Probation or Supervised Release)

**Michael Bautista** 

(For Offenses Committed On or After November 1, 1987)

Case Number: 1:96CR00408-001JB

USM Number: 06026-081

Defense Attorney: Phillip Sapien, Appointed

THE DEFENDANT:				
•	admitted guilt to violations of condition(s) <b>Special</b> of the term of supervision. was found in violation of condition(s) after denial of guilt.			
The defendant is adjudicate	d guilty of these violations:			
Violation Number	Nature of Violation		Violation Ended	
Special	The defendant failed to reside at and complete a program at 12/31/2015 Residential Reentry Center approved by the probation for a period of 6 months.			
The defendant is sentenced Reform Act of 1984.	as provided in pages 1 through	3 of this judgment. The sentence	ce is imposed pursuant to the Sentencing	
☐ The defendant has not v	violated condition(s) and is disc	charged as to such violation(s).		
name, residence, or mailing	address until all fines, restitution	on, costs, and special assessmen	r this district within 30 days of any change of nts imposed by this judgment are fully paid. y of material changes in economic	
9765		April 12, 2016		
Last Four Digits of Defendant's Soc. Sec. No.		Date of Imposition of Judgment		
1976		/s/ James O. Browning		
Defendant's Year of Birth		Signature of Judge	Signature of Judge	
Albuquerque, NM		Honorable James United States Dist	S	
City and State of Defendant's Residence		Name and Title of Judge		
		April 14, 2016 Date Signed		

Judgment - Page 2 of 3

Defendant: Michael Bautista
Case Number: 1:96CR00408-001JB

## **IMPRISONMENT**

The defendant is hereby committed to the custody of the United States Bureau of Prisons to be imprisoned for a total term of 5 months.

A term of supervised release will not be reimposed.

Although advisory, the Court has considered the Guidelines and, in arriving at its sentence, has taken account of the Guidelines with other sentencing goals. Specifically, the Court has considered the Guidelines' sentencing range established for the applicable category of offense committed by the applicable category of Defendant. The Court believes that the Guidelines' punishment is appropriate for this sort of offense. Therefore, the sentence in this judgment is consistent with a guideline sentence. The Court has considered the kind of sentence and range established by the Guidelines. The Court believes that a sentence of 5 months reflects the seriousness of the offense, promotes respect for the law, provides just punishment, affords adequate deterrence, protects the public, avoids unwarranted sentencing disparities among similarly situated defendants, effectively provides the Defendant with needed education or vocational training and medical care, and otherwise fully reflects each of the factors embodied in 18 U.S.C. Section 3553(a). The Court also believes the sentence is reasonable. The Court believes the sentence is sufficient, but not greater than necessary, to comply with the purposes set forth in the Sentencing Reform Act.

New Market					
	☐ The court makes the following recommendations to the Bureau of Prisons:				
$\boxtimes$	The defendant is remanded to the custody of the United States Marshal.				
	at on				
	as notified by the United States Marshal.				
	·				
	before 2 p.m. on				
	as notified by the United States Marshal.				
	as notified by the Probation or Pretrial Services Office.				
	DETAIDA				
	RETURN				
I have executed this judgment as follows:					
D (					
Defendant delivered on					
	at	with a Certified copy of this Judgment.			
	In	NITED STATES MARSHAL			
	OI	MILD STATES WARSHAL			
	By				
	Di	EPUTY UNITED STATES MARSHAL			